

REMARKS

In the Office Action, dated March 29, 2007, the Examiner states that Claims 1-17 are pending and Claims 1-17 are rejected. By the present Amendment, Applicant amends the specification, the claims, and Figure 15.

In the Office Action, Figure 15 is objected to as not being designated as prior art. Replacement Figure 15 which is labeled "prior art" is submitted, and therefore, this objection should be withdrawn. The specification has been amended to remove reference numerals "4" and "2" from paragraph 1, page 31 to overcome the objections to those references numerals in Figures 9A-9C. The specification has been amended to modify reference numeral "S90" in paragraph 2, page 32 to "S9" to overcome the objection to Figure 11. The specification has been amended at paragraph 1, page 33 to remove reference numeral "114" to overcome the objection to Figure 13.

In the Office Action, the specification is objected to for not containing a "Summary of Invention." The specification has been amended to identify the specific sections, including the Summary of Invention, and therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests this objection be withdrawn. The specification is also objected to for referencing to the claims. The references to the claims have been removed from the specification, and therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests that this objection also be withdrawn. Moreover, the uses of certain terms/phrases are objected to in the specification. The Applicant has corrected those terms/phrases that were objected to and has read through the specification and has attempted to correct to any other obvious errors. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests that the objections to the specification be deemed overcome.

In the Office Action, claims 1-15 are objected to because they include references characters which are not enclosed in parentheses. Accordingly, claims 1-5 have been amended to correct the informalities, and therefore, the current objection should be overcome. Claims 1, 5, 8, and 13 are also objected to for various informalities. The claims have been amended to overcome the current objections, and the Applicant respectfully requests the objections be withdrawn.

Claims 1-2, 6-11, 13 and 14 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-7 and 10-12 of copending Application No. 11/281,004. The Applicant has

canceled claim 9 and has incorporated its features into independent claim 1. The present amendment overcomes the double patenting rejection because the copending application does not claim that the wedge-shaped portion has an outside light beam absorption effect.

Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Masahiro (JP 2003-66206) in view of Cohen (U.S. 4,621,898). The present amendment to independent claim 1 also overcomes the obviousness rejection. Neither cited reference teaches or suggests that a wedge-shaped portion absorbs an outside light beam. Overall, the view angle control sheet of the present invention prevents the decrease in screen brightness. This feature is not disclosed in the cited references.

In light of the foregoing response, all the outstanding objections and rejections are considered overcome. Applicant respectfully submits that this application should now be in condition for allowance and respectfully requests favorable consideration.

Respectfully submitted,



August 29, 2007

Date

Attorney for Applicant
Brian W. Hameder
c/o Ladas & Parry LLP
224 South Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60604
(312) 427-1300
Reg. No. 45613